

REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 3, 9-11, 13-15, and 17 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 3, 9, and 13 are the independent claims. Claim 13 is withdrawn from consideration, and Claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein.

Claims 1, 3, 15, and 17 have been amended. It is submitted that no new matter has been added by the amendments herein.

Claims 9-11 have been allowed. In addition, Claim 3 was objected to but was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Since that claim was rewritten in independent form, Applicant submits that Claim 3 should be allowed.

The drawings have been objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as failing to show the feature “said shield member is attached in electrical connection to said shielding box”. Claims 15 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the same reason.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s objection and rejection. It is submitted that Figures 1A, 1B, and 2A clearly illustrate that shield member 4 is disposed on the flange 1b of shield box 1. Accordingly, no replacement drawings are being submitted herewith. Further, the specification at page 5, lines 19 to 23, page 7, lines 6 to 8, and page 7, lines 14 to 18, for example, explains that the shield members 4 are secured in a contact state in which they are electrically connected to the shield box. Applicant believes that this disclosure clearly conveys the above-quoted subject matter to one of ordinary skill in the art. Reconsideration and

withdrawal of the objection to the drawings and the rejection of Claims 15 and 17 are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 2 has been cancelled, and Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as to Claims 1 and 3. Claims 1 and 3, as amended, each recite (among other features) a shield box, a shield plate, and a shield member. As recited, the shield member is attached to one of the shield box and the shield plate, and a plurality of protrusions are formed on the other one of the shield box and the shield plate. Applicant submits that it is clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that there is one shield box and one shield plate, one of these being attached to a shield member and the other being formed with protrusions. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejection are requested.

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over prior art (admitted by Applicant) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,301,125 (Maeda). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 of the invention, as amended, recites an emitted-radio-wave shield including a shield box housing a circuit board, a shield plate removably secured to said shield box, and a shield member. The shield member has an attaching surface and an opposite contacting surface, which is formed from a resilient body, and which is disposed at a joint surface portion between the shield box and the shield plate, and is attached to one of the shield box and the shield plate, for shielding emitted radio waves from the circuit board in a state in which the shield plate is secured to the shield box. In the shield, the other one of the shield box and the shield plate is formed to have a plurality of protrusions, which project toward the

contacting surface of the shield member, so as to contact and press the shield member, such that the contacting surface of the shield member deforms in a concave shape so as to engage with the protrusions.

According to the invention, when access to the circuit board is required, removing and attaching the shield plate is very easy. Also, because the shield member deforms to engage with the protrusions, no gap is made between the shield box and the shield plate, and leakage of emitted radio waves in a closed state of the shield can be minimized. In addition, even if excessive force is applied, deformation of the shield plate can be prevented, since the shield member is made of elastic materials and can deform to absorb forces that occur during the attaching operation.

Maeda, which relates to a unit with a shield, is said to disclose a shield plate formed to have a plurality of protrusions which project toward and contact a shield member, which, as conceded in the Office Action, is not taught by the prior art admitted by Applicant.

Applicant submits that Maeda merely discloses that projections 16a, 16b formed on a shield plate 12 engage with portions 18a, 18b which are integrally formed on a shield plate 14. The shield plates 12 and 14 are directly snap-fitted together. Nowhere does Maeda disclose or suggest at least the feature of a shield member being disposed between a shield box and a shield plate in the manner recited in Claim 1 of the subject application. A gap would remain between the shield plates 12 and 14, according to that patent. Moreover, since Maeda teaches the use of complementary mating structures between the first shield plate 12 and the second shield plate 14, Applicant also submits that it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include an additional deformable shield member between the two plates.

With respect to the admitted prior art, Applicant submits that it does not disclose or suggest at least that a shield member is formed of a resilient body that is deformable to engage with protrusions of a contacting shield plate or shield box, as recited in Claim 1. Further, again, the prior art does not teach a shield plate formed to have a plurality of protrusions which project toward and contact a shield member, as conceded in the Office Action.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Claim 1 patentably distinguishes the invention over Maeda and the admitted prior art, whether taken individually or in combination.

Independent Claim 3 recites, among other features, a shield member formed from a resilient body, disposed at a joint surface portion between a shield box and a shield plate and attached to one of the box and the plate. The other one of the box and the plate is formed to have protrusions that project toward the shield member, so as to contact and press the shield member. The surface of the shield member deforms in a concave shape so as to engage with the protrusions, which are formed at regular intervals of 60 mm or less.

Applicant submits that Claim 3 distinguishes the invention over the prior art for reasons similar to why Claim 1 distinguishes the invention over the prior art. Applicant also submits that the prior art, whether taken singly or in combination, fails to teach or suggest that the protrusions as recited are formed at regular intervals of 60 mm or less.

Applicant, therefore, submits that Claims 1 and 3 patentably distinguish the present invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection are respectfully requested.


Applicant submits that the independent claims patentably define the invention over the cited art. Further, the dependent claims should be allowable for the same reasons that

the base claims from which they depend are allowable, and further due to the additional features that they recite. Individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration of the claims and passage to issue of the application at the Examiner's earliest convenience are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Melody H. Wu
Registration No. 52,376

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
MHW:ayr
148384 v 1